

Postal Regulatory Commission

Washington, D.C. 20268-0001

NOTICE OF FILING UNDER 39 U.S.C. § 404(d)

TO THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE:

Please take notice that on October 25, 2011, the Commission received two petitions for review of the Postal Service's determination to close the East Vassalboro post office located in East Vassalboro, Maine. The first petition for review was filed by Charles Ferguson. The second petition for review was filed by the Save Our Post Office Committee. The earliest postmark date is October 14, 2011.

This notice is advisory only and is being furnished so that the Postal Service may begin assembling the administrative record in advance of any formal appeal proceedings held upon the alleged (closing/consolidation) for transmittal pursuant to 39 CFR § 3001.113(a) (requiring the filing of the record within 15 days of the filing with the Commission of a petition for review). The Postal Service's administrative record is due no later than November 9, 2011.



Shoshana M. Grove
Secretary

Date: October 31, 2011

Attachment

Postal Regulatory Commission
Office of the Chief Admin. Officer

A2012-34

OCT 24 2011

October 22, 2011

2011 OCT 25 A 3:08

Office of the Secretary
Postal Regulatory Commission
901 New York Ave NW Suite 200
Washington, DC 20268-0001

POSTAL REGULATORY
COMMISSION

RE: Appeal to stop the closure of the East Vassalboro Post Office. Docket # 1361881-04935

To Whom It May Concern:

We, the customers and residents of East Vassalboro, protest and are appealing the decision to close our Post Office, and we urge the Postal Regulatory Commission to review the record, revise the Postal Service's determination and return the matter for further consideration.

We believe the Postal Service did not consider certain factors that it is required to such as; the time and place of the community meeting, the effect the closure would have on the community, and the requirement that the Postal Service provide a maximum degree of effective and regular services to rural areas and communities where Post Offices are not self-sustaining. Additionally, the Postal Service did not consider the possibility of a contractor-operated retail facility. That might meet the needs of the community if the closure proceeds.

We feel that, as citizens of the United States, we are entitled to the same efficient postal service provided to our counterparts in urban areas. The Postal Regulatory Act is explicit in pointing this out. We petition you, as members of the Postal Regulatory Commission, to consider our appeal and direct the Postal Service to keep meeting our service needs.

Respectfully,

Save Our Post Office Committee

Contact Information

Jan Murton jemurton@gmail.com 207-873-7257

Vivian Flamm vflamm@yahoo.com 207-923-3475

Helen LaFleur lafleur2827@roadrunner.com 207-923-3043

Diane Hogendorn jshogend@colby.edu 207-923-3491

Charles Ferguson c_@fairpoint.net

A2012-34

P.O. Box 44
East Vassalboro, ME 04935
13 October 2011

2011 OCT 25 A 3:27

Postal Regulatory Commission
901 New York Ave. N.W., Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20268-0001

Received
POSTAL REGULATORY
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: Docket no. 1361881-04935

OCT 19 2011

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Office of PAGR

I write as a member of the local "Save Our Post Office" committee in further support of the appeal filed by the committee against the USPS decision to close the Post Office in the village of East Vassalboro, Maine. Our appeal outlines the importance of the Post Office in the life of the village, and with the Commission's mandate in mind it points out the defects in the process followed by the Postal Service in deciding to close. Before adding comment, I wish to emphasize again a point made by Jan Murton in the appeal letter: thousands of dollars in metered postage, done by her rafting business in the East Vassalboro Post Office, were not credited to this office. This is surely irregular, and it has harmed our Post Office by greatly diminishing the volume of business credited to it.

The "Final Determination to Close..." posted in our Post Office on 5 October opens with a section headed "Responsiveness to Community Postal Needs." Certain items in the list of "additional concerns ... received during the proposal posting period" require comment:

- 7) change of address: this item is repeated as item 8 immediately below.
- 9) travel to another post office: this item is repeated as items 10 and 11 immediately below.
- 14) "Favorable": there is no indication of the concern or the response.
- 15) travel to another post office: this item essentially repeats items 9-11 above.
- 16) hours of P.O. box access: the response, "With rural delivery, you would have 24 hour access to your mail" is insulting.
- 19) address change: this item essentially repeats items 7 and 8 above. It is also unclear whether boxholders can retain "East Vassalboro" (04935) when boxes are located in North Vassalboro (04962).
- 20) mail security: this item essentially repeats item 12 above.

21) carrier services: this long item, listing four postal services, essentially repeats items 1 and 9-11 above.

22) carrier services: this item summarizes item 21 above.

23) patrons with disabilities: this item restates items 5 and 13 above.

26) change of address: this item restates items 7 and 8 above.

The document looks as though it had been generated by a bug-ridden computer.

Among "Some advantages of the proposal..." there are two defects:

2) 24-hour access to mail in a rural box: this repeats 16) above.

4) security of "individually locked mail compartments": nowhere does the document mention "CBUs" as a security option, much less explain what the acronym means.

Among "Some disadvantages of the proposal..." I find the address proposal redundant and again baffling:

3) "A change in the mailing address": here, as in item 19 above, it is unclear what is meant by "The community name [that] will continue to be used in the new address." According to this document, "East Vassalboro" (04935) will be replaced by "Vassalboro" (04989), while the boxes will be available at North Vassalboro (04962). It appears there must be a change, and it will be twofold.


Now for the "nonpostal concerns ... expressed from questionnaires, the community meeting, on the petition, and on the congressional inquiry":

1) nonpostal services: to be available at North Vassalboro. This item is repeated in 2 and 3 immediately following.

7) security of rural boxes: under "additional concerns" above, the response to no. 3 stated "there has not been any report of mail theft or vandalism in the area." Here, however, "there has been one report of mail theft or vandalism in the area." The inconsistency is typical of the shoddy nature of this document.

Please appraise these defects in a document which is intended to have such a heavy impact on the life of our community. Thank you in advance for your attention.

Yours truly,



Charles Ferguson